

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATT	FORNEY DOCKET NO.
-		7 [EXAMINER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
				7
			DATE MAILED:	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•		09/648,864	JOHNSON ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	-	Janet L Andres	1646	
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	
eriod fo	r Reply			
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re earne	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLIFICATION. MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Sions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply sis specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statule ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing datent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to solve the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the profile of the percent ARANDON	imely filed lys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
1)		his action is non-final.		
2a)□	The determination in condition for allow	vance except for formal matters.	prosecution as to the merits is	
3)	closed in accordance with the practice unde	r Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.	
Dispositi	ion of Claims			
•	Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application	on.		
•/-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)	Claim(s) is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)⊠	Claim(s) 1-24 are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
,	ion Papers			
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)□ acc	cepted or b) \square objected to by the E:	xaminer.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.65(a).	
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a)⊡ approved b)∐ disap _l	proved by the Examiner.	
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	ign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 11	9(a)-(d) or (t).	
а) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
	1. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received.		
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume	ents have been received in Applic	cation No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a	Rureau (PC) Rule 17.2(a)/.		
141	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dome	estic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(e) (to a provisional application).	
l	a) The translation of the foreign language Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	provisional application has been	received.	
Attachm				
1) NO	otice of References Cited (PTO-892) Stice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	5) Notice of Infor	mary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) mal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
5) [] "			Port of Paper No. 7	

Art Unit: 1646

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-15, drawn to methods of inhibiting IgE production, classified in class514, subclass 2.
- II. Claims 16-22, drawn to compositions of IFN chimeras, classified in class 424, subclass 85.4.
- III. Claim 23, drawn to polynucleotides, classified in class 435, subclass 69.51.
- IV. Claim 24, drawn to a method of suppressing IL-4 production, classified in class514, subclass 2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the methods of Invention I can be practiced with naturally occurring interferons or other pharmaceutical agents.

Inventions I and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotides of Invention III can not be used in the methods of Invention I.

Application/Control Number: 09/648,864

Art Unit: 1646

The methods of Invention I are distinct from those of Invention IV because they have different goals and thus different outcome measures.

The polynucleotides of Invention III are not related to the compositions of Invention II.

They differ structurally and functionally, can not be used together or interchangeably, and have non-coextensive searches and considerations.

Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the methods of Invention IV can be practiced with naturally occurring interferons or other pharmaceutical agents.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotides of Invention III can not be used in the methods of Invention IV.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the searches required for the different groups are not coextensive, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 09/648,864 Page 4

Art Unit: 1646

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

For Invention I, the species are:

- a) IFN alpha
- b) IFN beta
- c) IFN tau
- d) IFN omega
- e) IFN chimeras.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 2, and 9-15 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to

Art Unit: 1646

be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Janet Andres, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 305-0557. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yvonne Eyler, Ph.D., can be reached at (703) 308-6564. The fax phone number for this group is (703) 305-3014 or (703) 308-4242.

Communications via internet mail regarding this application, other than those under U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [yvonne.eyler@uspto.gov].

All Internet email communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Janet Andres, Ph.D. September 6, 2001

GARY L. KUNZ

PERMISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600